

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 11 and 12 being independent.

By this Amendment, Claims 1, 3-5 and 11-13 have been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in FIGS. 3 and 4. Claims 7 and 14 have been cancelled.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicant has combined Claims 13 and 14 as suggested by the Examiner so that Claim 13 is now directed to a "program stored on a computer-readable recording medium." Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 4, giving the recited "orientation" proper antecedent basis.

Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-7 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0009428, now U.S. Patent No. 6,784,904 (Dow et al.). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Dow et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,198,853 (Ichihara et al.). Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Dow et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,825,250 (Miyata et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicant's invention relates to a method of reading a plurality of originals including an image reading step, a placement orientation detection step, an image signal rotation step, and a read image signal display step. In addition to rotating the

image signal if the placement orientation of the original is different from a predetermined orientation, Claim 1 includes that the plurality of read image signals are displayed on one display screen in the orientation aligned with a predetermined orientation.

Claims 11 and 12 relate to a method and system, respectively, of displaying image information. These claims similarly recite that a plurality of originals are read by an image reading apparatus, and that the image information of the originals is aligned in a predetermined orientation irrespective of the detected placement orientation of the originals.

The Dow et al. patent relates to a scanner that reads images one-by-one and displays read images one-by-one. Various user operation and navigation buttons are located on the appliance (column 5, lines 23-26). If a user desires to change the orientation of a captured image, a rotation button can be activated to rotate the captured image (column 7, lines 60-63). The Office Action appears to rely on this rotation feature to teach certain features recited in the claims. Claim 1, however, is directed to a method that reads a plurality of images and displays the plurality of read image signals on one display screen. Further, these plurality of read images are aligned with a predetermined orientation. Dow et al. is without any teaching or suggestion of these features of Applicant's claimed invention, among others.

Independent Claims 11 and 12 similarly recite that placement orientations of a plurality of originals are detected and image information of the plurality of originals is aligned irrespective of the detected placement orientations of the plurality of originals. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these independent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1.

The secondary citations to Ichihara et al. and Miyata et al. have also been reviewed. Ichihara et al. relates to a detector for detecting the size of a document. Miyata et al. relates to an image forming apparatus in which a plurality of originals are individually exposed, scanned and read. Neither citation, however, is understood to compensate for the above-noted deficiencies with respect to Dow et al.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-6 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and Claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed to be in order, and such action is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 1, 11 and 12 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of these dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ann M. McCamey/

---

Ann M. McCamey  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 57,016

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
AMM/klm

FCHS\_WS 1790405v1